Standard V Program Re-approval Template

Submit completed form to your liaison by June 1, 2009.

Institution University of Washington

Date June 1. 2009

Dean/Director: Charles Peck Signature _____

What would be the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.1: Knowledge of Subject Matter and Curriculum Goals?

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	Teacher-Based Evidence *Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.*	Student-Based Evidence *Students demonstrate engagement in effective learning opportunities.*
A. Content driven. All students develop understanding and problem-solving expertise in the content area(s) using reading, written and oral communication, and technology. **B. Aligned with curriculum standards and outcomes.** All students know the learning targets and their progress towards meeting them. **C. Integrated across content areas.** All students learn subject matter content that integrates mathematical, scientific, and aesthetic reasoning.	PPA + (See Appendix A) Lesson plans collected through out student teaching Arts integration lessons (see Appendix E)	PPA+ Classroom Observation Protocol Video clips of student participation samples of student work

What would be the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.2: Knowledge of Teaching?

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	Teacher-Based Evidence *Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.*	Student-Based Evidence *Students demonstrate engagement in effective learning opportunities.*
A. Informed by standards-based assessment. All students benefit from learning that is systematically analyzed using multiple formative, summative, and self-assessment strategies. **B. Intentionally planned.** All students benefit from standards-based planning that is personalized. **C. Influenced by multiple instructional strategies.** All students benefit from personalized instruction that addresses their ability levels and cultural and linguistic backgrounds. **D. Informed by technology.** All students benefit from instruction that utilizes effective technologies and is designed to create technologically proficient learners.	* PPA+ (See Appendix A): o Context for Learning o Context Commentary o Lesson Plans for unit ▪ Instructional Materials ▪ Planning Commentary	* PPA+: Student work samples * Longitudinal Record: * Classroom Observation Protocol * Video clips of student participation

What would be the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.3: Knowledge of Learners and their Development in Social Contexts?

Criteria - *Evidence of teacher candidate practice reflect planning, instruction, and communication that is:*	Teacher-Based Evidence *Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.*	Student-Based Evidence *Students demonstrate engagement in effective learning opportunities.*
A. Learner centered. All students engage in a variety of culturally responsive, developmentally, and age appropriate strategies. **B. Classroom/school centered.** Student learning is connected to communities within the classroom and the school, including knowledge and skills for working with others. **C. Family/Neighborhood centered.** Student learning is informed by collaboration with families and neighborhoods. **D. Contextual community centered.** All students are prepared to be responsible citizens for an environmentally sustainable, globally interconnected, and diverse society.	• PPA+ (see Appendix A) o Context for Learning: Task 1 o Context Commentary	Student interest surveys Student interviews (see Student Learning Project assignment, p. 5 in present report) See Appendx F: Child Portrait

What would be the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.4: Understanding of Teaching as a Profession?

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	Teacher-Based Evidence *Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.*
A. Informed by professional responsibilities and policies. All students benefit from a collegial and professional school setting. **B. Enhanced by a reflective, collaborative, professional growth-centered practice.** All students benefit from the professional growth of their teachers. **C. Informed by legal and ethical responsibilities.** All students benefit from a safe and respectful learning environment.	• Observed participation in professional collaborative work in both practicum and coursework settings • Observation and video records of participation in professional learning community activities—e.g, Critical Friends Groups, collaborative project work • Observation of professional behavior and documentation of professional disposition, knowledge and skills in Longitudinal Record

1. In a narrative of 7-10 pages, describe how your program has changed to meet the requirements of Standard V in the following areas:

UW TEP Program Changes Relative to Standard V

The Elementary and Secondary Teacher Education Programs at University of Washington, Seattle, have been undergoing a process of evidence-based renewal and redesign over the past three years. Program renewal processes are also underway in the Special Education and Music Education programs in response to new requirements of Standard V, and related changes in the teacher preparation needs of public schools. The specific examples of program change in the present progress report are drawn primarily from the ELTEP (Elementary) STEP (Secondary) programs, with supplementary documentation from Special Education and Music.

Changes in Course Content.

Course work in TEP has been extensively revised based on recent studies of program outcomes (Nolen, et al, 2008; Varghese, et al 2007; Peck, et al 2006), and input collected systematically from partner schools and community members. (This process of evidence-based program renewal is described in detail later in the present report). Three general themes have emerged regarding changes needed in the programs: a) the need for preservice teachers to develop a *deeper understanding of the social contexts of student learning* (social relationships, classroom climate, family and community resources), b) the need for more effective training in *differentiation of instruction*, and c) the need for more effective training in *analysis of student learning* (including student perceptions of the learning process). These changes are consistent with the themes underlying Standard V. Significant changes in coursework have been implemented in response to these data.

Coursework changes in STEP. The Secondary Teacher Education Program faculty and partner school colleagues have met for the past two years to devise a restructured program with emphasis the themes identified above. Course work changes have included the following:

- *re-design of core courses in learning and development*. Changes in these courses emphasize understanding *student experiences* in the classroom, including students' understanding of their own learning processes (Standard 5.3). One example of the way in which these goals are addressed is called the "student learning project". An excerpt from one portion of this project is included below:

•

Step 5: Planning and conducting student interviews.

After each lesson-observation day, you will interview the same two students. You and your TEP partner should interview two students each (four total). However, you may collaborate, even use the same interview questions and pool your data, if you wish.

The goal of the interview is to try to find out what students took from instruction – what they learned about the topic, their peers, and themselves. You model is a provisional explanation of how the prior knowledge, relationships and representations influence learning, so you need to document that learning.

Before interviewing students, use what you know about them, the teacher's goals, the topics/concepts/skills and instructional activities to generate a list of appropriate interview questions and tasks.

You are strongly encouraged to devise a thinkaloud or extension task for your interviewees. This task should ask students to apply and extend what they are supposed to have been learning in the lesson. For example, if they have learned a technique for analyzing poetry, give them a new *short poem and ask them to think aloud as they analyze it. If they have learned how to ask or give directions in the target language, ask them to do this with a different location. If they have learned a principle in economics, or a version of an event, you might ask them to find parallels in a* similar but different *event. If they have learned an algorithm in mathematics, ask them to think aloud as they solve a new problem (concrete or word problems are particularly good), and ask them to explain why they are doing each step. We will work with you on developing thinkaloud tasks and probing for student understandings and conceptions.*

Try to get students to represent their understanding in a variety of ways (e.g., lists, diagrams, narrative accounts, pictures and so on). ***Don't be satisfied that students have truly understood what was taught simply because they can repeat, in essentially the same language, what their teacher told them.*** *Remember that the goal of this assignment is to understand how students construct meaning from instruction and classroom interaction -- how they try to make sense of what the teacher and other students say and do—as a way to test and revise your model of student learning. With this goal in mind, select the questions and follow-up questions that are most fitting given your particular situation. The questions you ask of students should be tied to the specific content of the instruction you observed and to what data you need to assess your model.*

- *development of new coursework in language, literacy and culture*. A new course has been developed which will be taught in conjunction with the new summer school practicum at Garfield High School (see section on Field Experiences below). This course is focused on development of assessment and instructional planning for students with special language and literacy needs (Standard 5.3).
- *More rigorous assessment of candidate performance.* In order to collect more comprehensive and rigorous evidence of candidate effectiveness in the classroom, we have augmented the Washington State PPA assessment protocol with a more extensive set of performance assessment procedures derived from the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). Excerpts from the Handbook for the PPA+, and related evaluation protocols, are presented in Appendx A. These classroom-based assessment protocols require extensive documentation of teaching practice, video records of student participation in the classroom, collection of student work samples, and analysis of learning outcomes for both the class as a group and individual students. Faculty have "backward mapped" from the requirements of this summative performance assessment to design a variety of course assignments and projects which prepare candidates to use a variety of teacher based and student based evidence to analyze learning outcomes for their students. The assignment evaluation rubric below (only partially represented here) shows an example of how this has been done the science methods course:

Rubric				
	Exceeds expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Needs improvement**	**Re-do**
Problem/ question posing	All students, despite their backgrounds could have reasonable expectation to engage in discourse about your question/task, i.e. you make the ideas accessible for kids to hypothesize about (this is part of CRT). Question/task had multiple	Most students have reasonable expectation of participating in discussion. Questions generate some discussion about student thinking.	Teacher fishing for a "right answer". Only a few students can participate in the discussion, due to lack of vocabulary or	No problem or questions posed to students.

	plausible answers that reveal student thinking, teacher not fishing for a "right answer" or "one-word responses."		life experience.	
Uncovering what students know (RSST)	Focus of lesson on you understanding what the students know rather than on instruction. After lesson, teacher can name (the following can be listed on the last page of the discourse tool.) 1) What students' partial understandings are. 2) What alternative conceptions students have about this topic. 3) What, if any, special vocabulary students use to talk about topic. 4) What experiences students have with the topic that can be used as leverage in an upcoming lesson.	Focus of lesson on understanding what the students know rather than on instruction. Some focus on instruction overshadows teacher's efforts to uncover student ideas. Teacher finds out what students generally know in the 4 categories.	Teacher focuses on instruction rather than on uncovering students ideas. Teacher has only modest knowledge of what students know.	Teacher ends up with no idea of what students know, what their alternative conceptions are, what they are interested in.

- *Supports during the first year of teaching*. One of the findings of our follow along research (Nolen, et al, 2008) was that many of our graduates struggled to apply concepts and practices they had learned in the program, and sometimes used successfully in student teaching, in the contexts of their first teaching position. To engage this issue, we redesigned requirements for the MIT to include two courses post-certification. The first of these courses, colloquially termed the "Reconnect and Recharge" seminars, is designed as a series of Saturday workshops (one per quarter) in which TEP graduates bring samples of student

work, classroom video clips and other artifacts of student learning from their classroom to use as a focus for addressing a "problem of practice" in their first year of teaching. The problems are addressed using collaborative group analysis protocols (Standard 5.4). The second course, the Capstone Portfolio, is being developed at present to align with requirements for the Professional Certification external assessment.

Coursework Changes in ELTEP. A similarly extensive redesign of coursework has been undertaken in the Elementary Program. Here also, the thematic drivers for the change process have focused on increasing candidate's understanding and responsiveness to their students' experiences of the learning environment (including differences in the experiences students from different cultures undergo in the "same" environment), differentiation of instruction, and analysis of student learning. Several examples of changes in coursework are listed below:

- *Seminar in Community-based Organizations*. This seminar was developed to accompany the new practicum experience in Community-based Organizations (CBO) that ELTEP candidates now complete in their first quarter of the program. The CBO course (and its related practicum) were designed to help candidates develop a richer and more personal understanding of the cultural resources of their students, their families and the communities in which they reside (Standard 5.3). One of the course assignments related to these goals appears below (an example of how one candidate responded to this assignment is included in Appendix F :

Portrait of a Child

Purpose: 1) To learn in depth about one child in your community based organization 2) to learn not only about who that child is from an individualistic perspective but to locate that child within a broader ecological perspective 3) To draw on your learning from the seminar, and your other courses in your development of this child's portrait (For example, you should explicitly draw on the assignments you did in differentiated instruction, literacy methods, and social studies in the development of your portrait 4) To do an analysis of what you would understand about that child if you were to only have information from some of the context and communities in which they live 5) To consider the ways in which you might work to develop this kind of understanding of all the individual children in your classroom.

- *New coursework in differentiated instruction*. In response to data suggesting that many of our candidates needed more effective training in understanding, planning and teaching students with a variety of cultural, linguistic and developmental characteristics, faculty designed a four quarter sequence of courses in Differentiated Instruction (EDTEP 544). These courses engage a wide variety of issues related to differences among students in the elementary classroom, but provide particular attention to children with special education needs and to children who are learning English (Standard 5.3).
- *More rigorous assessment of candidate performance*. The same procedures for improved candidate performance assessment have been implemented in the Elementary program as described above for STEP (this assessment generates evidence related to Standards 5.1 through 5.3—see Appendix A: PPA+). Following is an example of the kind of coursework assignment that has been backward mapped into coursework from the PPA+ :

> **Context for Learning: School/Classroom Profile.** Working with the other pre-service teacher(s) assigned to their classroom, candidates will write an overview of important features of their classroom context that influence their instructional decision-making. One profile will be turned in per pair or trio. There are two main purposes for this assignment. One is to serve as part of the formative assessment of pre-service teacher learning while another is to help students learn more about the summative PPA+ portfolio that will be due at the end of TEP. Due to its formative assessment nature, detailed feedback will be provided on each profile. This will be worth 50 points.

- *Supports during first year of teaching*. Coursework supports for graduates during their first year of teaching (as described above for STEP) have also been developed for ELTEP students.

Changes in Fieldwork

The fieldwork components of the UW Seattle TEP have also been revised substantially in the context of data on program outcomes, input from school partners and community members, and the implementation requirements of Standard V. A change of particular significance as been the placement of candidates for two quarters (STEP) and three quarters (ELTEP) of continuous work in one of our network of partner schools situated in ethnically diverse low-income communities (see ldescription of school partnerships in a later section for more detail). Changes specific to field experiences for STEP and ELTEP are described below.

STEP Field Experience Changes. The Secondary program as made three major changes in its field work components, all of which are designed to create closer linkages between coursework and field work experiences, and to provide more extensive opportunities for candidates to work with students with highly diverse educational needs.

- *1st Quarter Mediated Field Experiences*. Based on the follow along study of TEP candidate learning conducted by our secondary program faculty (Nolen, et al, 2008) we have developed a first quarter field experience model (called the "mediated field experience" in which methods course faculty accompany candidates into classrooms to work directly with P-12 students and partner school teacher colleagues
- *Garfield Summer School Practicum*. During the second quarter of the program (summer), all 75 STEP students participate each morning in the Garfield High School summer school "bridge" program, designed for entering high school freshmen considered at risk for difficulties in the transition to high school. UW faculty and TEP candidates work with a team of Garfield faculty to deliver the summer school program to approximately four hundred students. Candidates take integrated coursework in Multicultural Education, and Language, Literacy and Culture on site during the afternoons (after each day's summer school session). The focus of the coursework is on understanding and planning for the content area literacy learning needs of this highly diverse group of youth entering high school. (this experience addresses Standards 5.1, 5.2. 5.3, and 5.4)
- *Two quarter student teaching placement*. During the third and fourth quarters of the program, STEP candidates participate each day in a classroom in one of our network of 22 partner schools situated in low income communities around the Seattle/Puget Sound area. During Fall quarter candidates are in partner school classrooms each morning,

and return to campus in the afternoons for coursework. During Winter Quarter, candidates participate full time in partner school classrooms, and return to campus once per week for "problems of practice" seminars focused on issues of concern related to their classroom experiences. Classroom practicum throughout the two quarters is based on a "co-teaching" model, in which both the cooperating teacher and the candidate are continuously engaged with instruction, rotating and changing roles in relation to both the instructional needs of the (p-12) students, and the learning needs of the candidate. See Appendix B for a description of this model.

ELTEP Field Experience Changes. The changes we have made in the Elementary program field experiences are oriented around the same set of programmatic goals: increasing connections between coursework and fieldwork, and preparing teachers to work in racially and linguistically diverse schools in low income communities. We approach these goals somewhat differently in the context of the new ELETEP program structure:

- Community-Based Organizations. As described earlier, an entirely new type of field experience has been developed for ELTEP, focused on placing students in one of a variety of community-based organizations, including community arts programs, boys and girls clubs, after school child care programs, and others. All of these CBO placements are made in the same racially and ethically diverse communities in which our partner schools are situated. Some examples include El Centro de la Raza, the Urban League, the Vietnamese Friendship Children's Center, and others. The purpose of this field experience is to give candidates some personal perspective on children's lives *outside* of school, particularly in terms of family and community cultural assets and resources. (Standard 5.3)
- *Studio Days* We have developed a practice in ELTEP in which multiple faculty collaborate with partner school colleagues to hold special day-long classes in one of the TEP partner schools. These "studio days" are aimed at creating a context in which candidates, faculty and partner school colleagues can collaborate in working with P-12 students, and in which they can share discussion of their work. An explicit goal for the design of the Studio Day practice has been to carry out some kind of service to the children and teachers of the partner school, while at the

same time addressing the learning needs of teacher candidates. For example, one of the regular Studio Day projects has been conducting individualized reading and math assessments for children. TEP candidates work in several classrooms during the day doing assessments with children, meet with their course instructor to analyze the data, and report back to the classroom teacher at the end of the day. This practice effectively provides the classroom teacher with a level of individual assessment data that she or he might not otherwise have time to collect, and also provides TEP candidates with very real experience doing classroom assessment under the direct supervision of their course instructor. Studio Days are now a regularized ELTEP practice across all methods courses, and occur three to four times a quarter. (addresses Standard 5.1, 5.2 primarily)

- *Full Academic Year Placement in a Partner School*. The redesigned ELTEP includes a field placement in one of our Ackerley Partner Schools for the full academic year. During August and September candidates participate full time in the school, sharing school start up duties with their cooperating teacher. Fall quarter they participate in the school two days per week, while taking courses at the University on the other three days. Winter Quarter their field participation increases to three days per week. During Spring Quarter, candidates participate full time in Partner School classrooms, returning to campus once per week for faculty led Problems of Practice seminars, in which they bring examples of student work, video clips and other artifacts of student learning to focus their collaborative problem solving work. (Standards 5.1. 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)

P-12 Partnerships

Partnership for TEP are structured around the Ackerley Partnership for Teacher Development—a network of 22 elementary, middle and high schools situated in racially and culturally diverse, low-income communities in Seattle and surrounding districts. The aspects of the Ackerley Network work that are most directly related to TEP are described briefly below. Appendix C presents a more comprehensive description of the Network, mission, goals and activities. School partners are intentionally selected for membership in the Ackerley Network because they provide the kinds of learning opportunities that are most relevant to our programmatic goals to prepare teachers for high needs urban and (increasingly) suburban schools. The work of the Network is designed in accordance with

John Goodlad's concept of "simultaneous renewal"—that is, the idea that partnerships can and should be intentionally designed to produce learning and program improvement outcomes for both the university and the public schools. Another of our key precepts has been the idea that (P-12) student learning should be central to the design of school-university partnerships. Consequently, we have attempted to design our partnership work with a focus on the ways in which our teacher education program can produce a visible and valued contribution to the learning of students in our partner schools. Several specific design features of our partnerships are fundamental to achieving this outcome:

- *Concentration of student teaching placements in a small number of schools*. We have rethought our approach to candidate placements with an eye to concentrating their participation in high needs schools, so that we can a) build stronger and more effective relationships with these schools, b) provide more continuous and effective support to candidates and cooperating teachers, and c) so that teacher candidates represent a more significant and usable human resource to the work of the schools. Our experience with this model to date, in which we placed up to 10 student teachers in a single school, suggests that this practice offers a very promising strategy for making participation with UW TEP as significant "value added" experience for our school partners. In contrast to the traditional model of spreading student teacher placements thinly across many schools (so as not to place too much of a "burden" on the schools), we are finding that in concentrating our placements, candidates are better able to functionally contribute to the work of the partner schools, particularly by adding significant amounts of adult instructional time to the human resources of the school.
- *Adoption of a "Co-teaching" model for candidate* participation *in the classroom.* Consistent with the principle of "putting student learning in the center" of redesign efforts for the program, we have adopted the co-teaching model for student teaching experiences in partner schools (see Appendix B). The Co-teaching approach essentially requires that both the candidate and the cooperating teacher be continuously engaged with student learning. The model does not preclude experiences for candidates with managing the whole class, but rather provides guidelines and practical models for utilizing a second teacher in the classroom as a resource for instruction. Appendix B provides several examples of how co-teaching may be enacted flexibly depending on the needs of students, candidates and the specific classroom setting. There is now a reasonable strong

evidentiary warrant for this practice based on analysis of (p-12) student learning outcomes. There is no evidence that participating in a co-teaching model for student teaching adversely affects the development of novice teachers.

- *Regular meetings with Partner School Liaisons*. Each school in the Ackerley Network has an identified Network liaison, who meets monthly with other liaisons and TEP staff to plan Network activities, and to coordinate work with TEP. In addition to TEP activities such as Studio Days, the Network sponsors a variety of professional development activities. Recent events have focused on topics related to race and equity, neurological aspects of learning science, and instruction of English language learners.
- *Ackerley Principals Meetings*. Principals of the Ackerley Network schools have a monthly breakfast meeting in which they discuss problems of practice related to serving children and families from low income communities. These problem solving sessions have been characterized as extremely useful by many of the Network principals.

Faculty Development

Our commitments to preparing teachers to work in schools situated in racially and ethnically diverse low income communities implies a significant need for development of new kinds of faculty competence. We have pursued several linked strategies to address these needs. First, we have offered a variety of traditional "workshop" kinds of events in collaboration with the Ackerley Network. Faculty attendance at these has been variable, but those that have attended have been positive about their value. Professional development workshops and seminars have been offered related to multicultural education and race equity, English language learners, and response to intervention (RTI) methodologies. Another traditional approach to professional development we have used consists of workshops offered at regular faculty retreats—often utilizing specialized expertise from within the faculty itself. For example, as a recent day long faculty meeting Professor Manka Varghese, a nationally recognized scholar in the area of English Language Learners and immigrant education, provided faculty colleague with an introduction to the concepts and teaching practices related to some of the "Academic Language" skills required for children to have access to the content being taught in the public school classroom.

A second approach we have used is to recognize and support the role of our partner schools as a context for professional development of our faculty—and we believe this strategy has been exceptionally productive. The essence of our "theory of action" here is that the relationships we build with school partners are the *medium* through which our own learning occurs. Focused and intensified commitments to a smaller number of partner schools have strengthened these relationships, and related opportunities for faculty learning and development. Moreover, the dramatic shift in the nature of the schools with which UW TEP is partnering has had a profound effect on opportunities for our faculty to re-appraise their own knowledge and skills. Program practices which have been built around these new relationships include the Studio Days and Mediated Field Experiences described earlier. Each of these in effect constitutes a new "setting" which affords faculty valuable opportunities to see the kinds of challenges faced by teachers in highly diverse low income communities—and to see how talented and effective teachers engage those challenges. The dialogues with partner school teachers and related observations and participation in the work of the partner schools offer some of the most powerful professional development we have observed for our faculty.

Third, we have created significant new feedback links which help our faculty understand and engage the problems of practice our candidates experience both before and after graduation. During the fourth quarter (student teaching) of both the Elementary and Secondary programs, candidates return to campus with carefully selected artifacts documenting student learning challenges in their classrooms. TEP faculty lead collaborative problem solving groups related to these problems, *and collect data on the nature and extent of the specific kinds of problems candidates face*. This information challenges (and motivates) faculty to develop and/or refine coursework content in a way that is responsive to the problems candidates are describing. A similar process is used to document and analyze problems of practice faced by first and second year graduates of the program in the context of the R&R Seminars described previously. The faculty inquiry and course development process which is driven by what they learn about the problems their students are facing in the classroom provides powerful motivation to take up opportunities to learn afforded by more formal professional development events, such as those sponsored by the Ackerley Network, those offered at TEP faculty meetings, and those available at professional conferences

2. In no more than three pages, describe the *process* used to engage program personnel in reviewing, rethinking, and revising the program.

The program renewal process at University of Washington has been driven by three major activities. First, we have collected and analyzed *evidence of candidate learning and performance* as a primary source of influence over program change decisions. Second, we formed several *study groups*, comprised of community members, P-12 educators, and university faculty to review the present program in the context of current school and community needs. Third, we formed a *Program Renewal Lead Team* for both the elementary and secondary programs, comprised of TEP faculty, P-12 school partners and faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences, to integrate the input we had collected and develop recommendations for program change. Proposed program changes have been reviewed on multiple occasions by our PEAB.

<u>Elementary Program Change Process</u>

Over three years ago, Elementary TEP faculty, staff and P-12 colleagues agreed to jointly undertake a major program inquiry and renewal effort. A variety of issues and concerns motivated this initiative. These included changing state Standard V policies, as well as faculty, staff and student concerns about changing needs of public education in an era of high stakes accountability, increased public concern about the quality of learning opportunities afforded to many historically disenfranchised groups of students, and concerns about the extent to which the coherence of the original vision for the program had been sustained over time. With support from the College and a grant from the Carnegie Teachers for a New Era project, faculty from the College of Education, faculty from the College of Arts and Science, and public school colleagues initiated a year-long study of the program. Four study groups were organized around issues of concern expressed by program faculty, staff, and students related to program philosophy, program outcomes, and issues of social justice in teaching. A wide variety of data collection and analysis processes were completed, including case studies of student experiences in TEP, analysis of extant data from surveys of program graduates and employers, discussions with community members, and follow up studies of the problems of practice reported by program graduates. Members of the ELTEP community, including partner school colleagues, faculty (from the College of Education and the College of Arts and Science), and staff met to review results of the various inquiry processes and to discuss their implications

for program design. A "Summer Work Team" (SWT) was formed to take up recommendations developed during the Retreat and develop a program proposal. This proposal was presented to our PEAB, and approved. The new ELTEP Program was initiated in Spring/Summer of 2008.

Secondary Program Renewal. The renewal process developed somewhat differently in the Secondary Program. In contrast to the elementary program, a clear consensus did not exist among secondary faculty regarding the need for program renewal and redesign. There was, however, general agreement about the value of empirical inquiry regarding the outcomes and effectiveness of the program. Accordingly, a study was designed by a small group of secondary faculty (and subsequently supported by the Teachers for a New Era project) in which several students were followed (via observation and interview) through their entire program. Data were collected in a variety of formal and informal settings. A specific focus of this study had to do with the ways in which students constructed their understanding of teaching, and their identities as teachers, across their experiences in these settings. Results of this study were presented in faculty meetings throughout the year, where the data generated considerable interest and concern among secondary program faculty and staff about the coherence and effectiveness of the program. In February, a faculty vote endorsed initiation of a formal program renewal process. We viewed this change in STEP faculty stance toward the need for program renewal as an important example of "evidence-based decision making" at work.

A second (but related) process of change which had been underway for several months in the Secondary program is the "Garfield Expedition", created by secondary math education faculty member Lani Horn, and her colleagues. Lani had been working with secondary program faculty member Sue Nolen on the TNE-funded case studies of TEP students in the Secondary Program, where she observed a variety of "disconnects" between the experiences her students were undergoing in the program. An issue of particular concern was the difficulty students had connecting ideas and practices presented in coursework with their work in school settings. While this problem is well known—in fact, it may be the most fundamental problem in teacher preparation—Lani's direct observations and interviews with students made the issue more concrete, personal and disturbing, not only to her but to others in the program. In fact, the data were so compelling that Lani initiated a project in which she moved her math methods course directly into the site of her work (undertaken in collaboration with Jim King of the UW Math Department) with math teachers at Garfield High School—a highly diverse urban school near the UW. There TEP candidates, math

department faculty, and UW faculty (Jim and Lani) worked together to promote improvements in math learning outcomes for Garfield students in freshman algebra courses. Their collaborative efforts had a dramatic impact on student achievement, improving pass rates for these courses from below 50% to over 80% over the course of the year.

Although the Garfield High School partnership is perhaps the most visible and dramatic example of program renewal work taken up by secondary program faculty in response to new data about their students' learning, it is by no means the only example. A variety of individual actions have already been initiated by STEP faculty in response to their emerging data-grounded concerns about the program. For example, one senior faculty member, who enjoys a campus wide reputation for excellence in teaching, had taught his social studies teacher candidates to implement a practice known as "Socratic Seminar", which requires a close and analytic reading of important contemporary and historical texts. However, data on student responses to candidates' use of this technique showed that many students did not have the literacy skills required to read the requisite texts. When these data were presented in a faculty meeting, the course professor exclaimed "Whoa…this changes everything. I can see that I have to completely rethink my syllabus". He subsequently implemented a variety of content-relevant reading skills into his course, which helped candidates prepare their students to succeed with the reading they needed to do in order to participate in the Socratic Seminar process. Data on candidate outcomes, and their impacts on the learning of P-12 students have been the most powerful factor affecting the process of program renewal and change in the UW Teacher Education Program.

Evidence-driven renewal in the Secondary Program was led by a team of faculty from the College of Education, College of Arts and Science, and colleagues from our secondary school partners. A comprehensive new design for the Secondary Program was produced in 2008. Major features of the new program designed included program wide implementation of field-based coursework experiences, a summer school program in which TEP candidates work everyday with incoming freshmen in the Bridge Program at Garfield High School, followed by afternoon seminars with College faculty and Garfield staff, and a continuous practicum from August through March in one of our network of high needs partner schools. The first cohort of the new Secondary Program was started in March, 2009.

3. **In no more than two pages, describe the key strategies by which candidates will develop capacity to analyze and respond to student-based evidence. Please attach three samples of assignments or assessments that represent those strategies.**

The core instructional model which is taught and assessed in the UW program consists of a cycle of student-focused systematic planning, instructional design, **assessment/analysis of student learning**, and reflection. This cycle is embedded in coursework assignments throughout the program and forms the core of the final performance assessment required for all candidates (the PPA+). For the purposes of the present report, we will focus on description of the Assessment of student learning portion of the PPA+, but it is important to note that student-based evidence is used through out the cycle of planning and instruction to shape decisions related to curriculum (such as analysis of students' prior knowledge and interests) and instruction (such identification of academic language supports needed by individual students to ensure they understand what they are asked to do).

The PPA+ represents a fusion of required elements of the Washington State PPA, together with the structural features of the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). The general requirements related to student-based evidence related to student learning in the PPA+ are described below:

Task 4. Assessing Student Learning

Purpose

The Assessment of Student Learning task illustrates how you diagnose student learning needs through your analysis of student work samples. It provides evidence of your ability to 1) select an assessment tool and criteria that are aligned with your central focus, student standards, and learning objectives; 2) analyze student performance on an assessment in relation to student needs and the identified learning objectives; and 3) use this analysis to identify next steps in instruction for the whole class and individual students.

Overview of Task

- Summarize and analyze meaningful patterns in whole class performance on a selected student assessment **from the unit.** The assessment should be the work of individuals, not groups.
- Demonstrate a variety of student performances for the assessment using three student work samples.
- Analyze the performance of two individual students and diagnose individual learning needs.

The two rubrics which are used to evaluate candidate collection and use of student-based evidence to make instructional decisions are presented below:

ANALYZING STUDENT WORK FROM AN ASSESSMENT **H6: How does the candidate demonstrate an understanding of student performance with respect to standards/objectives?**			
Level 1	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4**
• The criteria/rubric and analysis have **little connection** with the identified standards/objectives. OR • Student **work samples do not support the conclusions** in the analysis.	• The criteria/rubric and analysis **focus on what students did right or wrong** in relationship to identified standards/objectives. • The analysis of whole class performance describes **some differences in levels** of student learning for the content assessed.	• The criteria/rubric and analysis **focus on patterns of student errors, skills, and understandings** to analyze student learning in relation to standards/objectives. • Specific patterns are identified for **individuals or subgroup(s)** in addition to the whole class.	All components of Level 3 plus: • The criteria/rubric and analysis focus on **partial understandings** as well. • The analysis is **clear and detailed.**

USING ASSESSMENT DATA TO INFORM TEACHING **H7: How does the candidate use the analysis of student learning to propose next steps in instruction?**			
Level 1	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4**
• Next steps are **vaguely related to or not aligned with the identified student needs**. OR • Next steps are **not described in sufficient detail** to understand them. OR • Next steps are **based on inaccurate conclusions** about student learning from the assessment analysis.	• Next steps focus on improving student performance through **general support that addresses some identified student needs**. • Next steps are **based on accurate conclusions about student performance** on the assessment.	• Next steps focus on improving student performance through **targeted support** to individuals and groups to address specific identified needs. • Next steps are **based on whole class patterns** of performance and **some patterns for individuals and/or subgroups**.	All components of Level 3 plus: • Next steps demonstrate a **strong understanding** of both the identified **content and language standards/objectives** and of **individual students and/or subgroups**.

4. **In no more than two pages, describe areas of your revised program that will be a focus of continuing attention and development as you proceed with implementation.**

There are three major areas in which we recognize the need for further program development at this time. First, while we have begun to address issues related to cultural and linguistic diversity of the students our candidates teach in our partner schools, we recognize that these challenges are much deeper than we have yet been able to address. We have designed several feedback loops which offer us collective "opportunities to learn" related to these issues. For example, we have recently begun a series of seminars, called Problems of Practice (PoP), wherein candidates bring artifacts of their work in partner school classrooms, including samples of student work, video tapes and field notes describing an issue of concern they have encountered in their work with children. These problems become the focus of collaborative work amongst candidates and faculty, but they are also catalogued and analyzed by faculty as a course of feedback and guidance for the TEP curriculum. These data have made it quite evident that we have much to learn about how to prepare candidates to create strong and supportive relationships with children and families whose lives are quite different than their own.

Second, while we have begun the process of re-orienting our analysis of program outcomes to include more focused attention to the impacts our candidates have on their own students' learning, we have much to learn about how to measure these kinds of outcomes, particularly in the context of substantial differences in the conditions under which candidates teach. This is not a new problem in teacher preparation, but it is one that becomes more salient in the context of our work in high needs schools. The simple fact is that it is *easier* to teach in schools where children lead lives relatively untroubled by issues of poverty, racism and community violence. Working in communities challenged by these social conditions does not change the fact that candidates are responsible to produce positive learning outcomes for children… but it does raise significant issues about how programs of teacher preparation provide equitable evaluations of candidate performance under markedly different teaching conditions.

Third, we are continuing to work toward program designs that make our participation in partner schools a visible "value added" to the challenging work they are engaging on a daily basis. We are making some progress on this—having redesigned our field work requirements with an eye to contributing to student learning outcomes in our partner schools, developed on-site coursework

experiences ("Studio Days") in which our students work with p-12 students in ways that are designed to provide individualized attention, detailed classroom observations and assessment data, and related supports to the classroom teachers, and developed joint opportunities for professional development for faculty and partner school colleagues. Most recently, we have adopted the "co-teaching" model for teacher candidate practicum work—a model with some research-based evidence of positive impact on student learning. At the same time, it is abundantly clear to us that high needs public schools—particularly those under the most AYP pressure, do not have discretionary time to devote to preparing new teachers *unless the work of teacher preparation is designed to contribute to their students' learning*. Consequently, we recognize the need to continue our investment developing models for university-based teacher education which "place P-12 student learning in the center" of the program design process.

Fourth, we have much to learn about how to incorporate program outcome data into regularized and ongoing processes of program renewal and change. The intensity of our investments in program redesign over the past three years have been integrally tied to the shift of our program goals toward a focus on preparing teachers for high needs urban schools. So some of the most significant challenges of the change process have been engaged, with notable successes. However, the institutionalization of evidence-driven program renewal on an ongoing and sustainable basis is a challenge we recognize and are engaging at present.

5. **Please attach a letter from the PEAB chair that describes the PEAB's involvement in reviewing and revising the program.**

   See attached email from Debbie Aldous, PEAB Chair

List of Appendices

Appendix A: PPA+

Excerpts from the PPA+ are presented, including the evaluation rubrics which are used to assess candidate competence. The PPA+ is responsive to Standard V emphasis on the need for both "teacher-based" and "student-based" evidence related to candidate achievement of knowledge and skill standards. The PPA+ requires candidates to collect evidence of student learning, and systematically analyze that evidence relative to planning/revising their instruction.

Appendix B: Co-Teaching

The Co-teaching model for student teaching emphasizes the ongoing active engagement of *both* the candidate and the cooperating teacher in a variety of activities directly related to student learning. This model is intended to displace the traditional "replacement" of student teaching, which has too often led to a net loss in effective instructional time for P-12 students. There is considerable research evidence to suggest that this model may lead to more positive P-12 student learning outcomes that the "replacement" model, with no collateral harm to candidate outcomes in learning to teach.

Appendix C: 2007-08 Report to the Ackerley Foundation

This report provides a detailed account of the activities and outcomes of our work with partner schools in the 2007-08 academic year. These data are not yet available for the current academic year.

Appendix D: Candidate Observation Protocol

This is aligned with the PPA+, and is used to monitor and evaluate candidate performance in the classroom over time.

Appendix E: Sample assignments related to integration of aesthetic, mathematical, scientific reasoning

These are several examples of ways in which the program has attempted to prepare candidates to create classroom experiences which help P-12 students integrate a variety of cognitive modalities in identifying and solving problems.

Appendix F: "Cally" a portrait.

This is one example of how a TEP candidate responded to the assignment in the ELTEP Community-Based Organization practicum to develop a "portrait" of a child based on this community-based, non school experience.